



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

V.—*On the Composition of the Cyngeticus of Xenophon.*

By T. D. SEYMOUR,

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN WESTERN RESERVE COLLEGE.

Xenophon at Scillus, as Diogenes Laertius reports, spent his time in *hunting*, entertaining his friends and writing his histories—διετέλει κυνηγετῶν καὶ τοὺς φίλους ἐσπιῶν καὶ τὰς ἱστορίας συγγράφων. Even without this express statement we might safely infer his devotion to the chase from the frequent and loving references to hunting in his larger works. From the *Anabasis* to the *Oeconomicus* no one of his writings is without some allusion to this pastime, or some illustration drawn from it.

In the first book of the *Anabasis* we have a digression upon the chase of the wild ass and the ostrich, and a comparison of the flesh of the ass with that of the partridge, a bird which, as we know from the ancient monuments, was often hunted and shot on the wing in Persia. Cyrus the younger is praised as φιλοθηρότατος καὶ πρὸς τὰ θηρία φιλοκινδυνότατος, and an anecdote is told of his prowess in conflict with a bear. In one of the villages of Armenia the Greeks captured the Komarch's daughter, but her bridegroom was "off hunting hares"—λαγῶς ᾤχετο θηρίσων. In the fifth book of the *Anabasis*, Xenophon says in praise of his home at Scillus that there are θῆραι πάντων ὅποσα ἐστὶν ἀγρενόμενα θηρία.

In the *Memorabilia*, Socrates is represented as often comparing and contrasting the acquisition of friends to the pursuit of game. Friends are not to be taken κατὰ πόδας like hares, nor ἀπ' αἵτης as birds. He tells Theodota that she needs some one to act the part of a hound (ἀντὶ κυνός) for her—to scent out the rich who are susceptible to the charms of beauty and drive them into her nets. In another place he says that men of the best natural endowments need the most careful training, as the best dogs, if neglected, become the worst.

In the *Hellenica* Xenophon mentally smacks his lips as he tells us (iv, 1, 15) of the palace of Pharnabazus, where

Agesilaus found such good hunting in the parks and forests. An observation like this we could hardly find in Thucydides.

The writer of the Spartan State remarks the care bestowed on the hunting dogs, and the importance attached to hunting in the education of the Spartan youth.

But it is in the *Cyropaedia*, where the writer's fancy had free sway, that his love of the chase is most conspicuous. Cyrus as a child fawned on his grandfather like a puppy on his master. On his first great hunt he cried out like a blooded puppy on approaching the game. His first battle was on occasion of a hunt of the Assyrian prince. In the celebrated sixth chapter of the first book, Cambyses directs his son how to take advantage of the enemy by recalling the arts which he had used against the hares and larger game, describing the pursuit undoubtedly much as it was carried on in Greece, just as elsewhere in this romance many Spartan regulations are ascribed to the ideal Persians.

The Armenians were more willing to yield to Cyrus because they had hunted with him years before. Chrysantas urges the other Persians to enroll themselves for the cavalry, that they may be better able to pursue a man or a wild beast. The son of Gobryas lost his life because by his success in the chase he excited the jealousy of the Assyrian crown prince. Finally, as soon as Cyrus was established at Babylon, he appointed masters of the hounds and took his court out to hunt.

Such evidence of devotion to venery prepares us to accept the further statement of Diogenes that Xenophon wrote a treatise on hunting. A tract under that title is found in MSS. of Xenophon's works, and is referred to as his by authors and lexicographers since the early part of the second century of our era. It covers about thirty-three pages of Teubner's text, and is divided into thirteen chapters. The first is introductory; the next describes the nets; the next six chapters describe the dogs and methods of taking the hare; the ninth is devoted to the chase of the deer; the tenth to the wild boar; the eleventh, only a few sections, to lions, leopards, lynxes, panthers, and bears; the twelfth and

thirteenth are a defence of the chase and an attack upon sophists.

The external evidence for the Xenophonticity of this work is strong. We know that Xenophon was devoted to hunting; that he was an eminently practical man; as he wrote treatises on kindred subjects, as horsemanship, he might be expected to write on this subject, and Diogenes Laertius tells us that he did write such a treatise. Arrian of Nicomedeia, who flourished at the beginning of the second century of our era, was not content with writing another *Anabasis* (of Alexander) and a second *Memorabilia* (of Epictetus), but reasserted his right to the name which he bore of *Ξενοφῶν ὁ Ἀθηναῖος* by writing a short *Cynegeticus* as a continuation of the work of the son of Gryllus, on the ground that the elder had not known the Celtic dogs and the Libyan and Scythian horses.

This work of Arrian is in itself most insignificant, but its authenticity has not, to my knowledge, been questioned. It begins with an evident allusion to Xenophon's first chapter—*Ξενοφῶντι τῷ Γρύλλου Λέλεκται . . . οἱ παιδευθέντες ὑπὸ Χείρωνι τὴν παιδευσιν ταύτην ὅπως Ξεοφιλείς τε ἦσαν καὶ ἐντιμοὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα*. Thro the whole work also, Arrian refers to the views of his master, occasionally confirming and occasionally correcting them. E. g., he says (IV, 5) that he has no objection to *χαροπὰ ὄμματα*, which Xenophon (III, 23) considers bad. Again, Arrian does not consider a uniform color a fault, while Xenophon calls it *θηριῶδες*.

Aelian, living at the same time as Arrian, says (*de nat. an.* XIII. 24) *Ξενοφῶν δὲ ὑπὲρ κυνῶν λέγει καὶ ταῦτα*—quoting from *Cyn.* IV, 9, and elsewhere refers to this work.

Hermogenes, in the latter half of the same second century, quotes Xenophon's description of the hounds smiling and scowling and doubting. One expression is not a verbal quotation, but the rhetorician was probably quoting from memory.

Athenaeus, Libanius, Pollux, Harpocration, and Suidas also refer to the work, and have words and phrases from it.

The tract presents many peculiarities, so many indeed that there is but a poor basis for conjectural emendation. But Valckenaer is said to have been the first to suspect the author-

ship of the work. In his notes to Euripides's *Hippolytus* (published in 1768) he says: "Xenophon aut quicumque scripsit *Cynegeticon*." Afterwards he seems to have confined his suspicions to the proëmium, in which Schneider agrees with him. L. Dindorf also in the preface to the last critical edition (Oxford, 1866) says that Valckenaer was right in limiting his suspicions to the proëmium and the epilogus, which is no better, "*nam quod in hoc libello et imperativorum formae sunt Macedonicae potius quam Xenophontaeae et aliae multae non Atticae, non sufficit ad eripiendum illum Xenophonti, nisi alia accesserint argumenta.*"

Here apparently the case stands to-day. No one claims the authenticity of the introduction, as Bernhardt says in his "*Wissenschaftliche Syntax*," who does not have a mean opinion of Xenophon's understanding; and most agree with Haupt (Opp. I, 195) in saying that the original work must have begun with the last section of the first chapter; but so far as I have seen, critics have, with the exception of introduction and epilogue, affirmed or denied the Xenophonticity of the treatise as a whole, and mainly on general grounds.

There seems indeed much uncertainty in discussing this question in detail. Xenophon spent much of his life out of Attica. If we adopt the view which seems to me most probable, that he was not much more than thirty years of age\* when he went to join Proxenus and Cyrus, he spent most of his life in campaigns in Asia Minor and in Peloponnesus. It is not strange then that Sauppe finds in his writings three hundred and sixteen poetic words, ninety-nine ionic, and sixty-three doric. A large number of these unattic words are in the *Cynegeticus*, but from this alone no inference can be drawn, especially as some allowance may be made for the influence of the subject in introducing unusual words. So those who have rejected other opuscula of Xenophon have based their judgment on the matter or the style, not on the unXenophontic use of words. Thus Boeckh rejected the *Athenian State* because it must have been written during the Peloponnesian war. Later authorities are still more definite. Kirchhoff

---

\* See the argument by Professor Morris, *Transactions* for 1874.

assigns it to 424 B. C., while Moritz Schmidt and Faltin set it 430–429. Their arguments are based on the allusions to the taxes, to the comedy, and to the naval supremacy of Athens, and they are convincing.

In a work on hunting, however, we do not expect such references to public affairs, and in fact we find in our tract no hint of the kind. Nets are described as used as they were in the Middle Ages (as is shown by the allusions in old German literature), and as we find them pictured on the monuments at Koyunjik. Dogs are described as showing their proximity to the game in the same way as at the present day. Horses and bows are not used, but that seems a peculiarity of place, not of time.

The Xenophontic authorship of the Agesilaus has been disputed because of the florid style of the rhetorical encomium, and because, tho Xenophon died at an advanced age only a year or two later than the Spartan king, the work bears few marks of the old age of the writer. Some have assumed the existence of a grandson of Xenophon, of the same name, as the opponent of Deinarchus (this can hardly have been *our* Xenophon, for Deinarchus made his first public speech 336 B. C.), and as the author of the Agesilaus, the epilogue of the Cyropaedia, the treatise on the Revenues of Athens, and the editor of the Hellenica and the Spartan State. But there is no reason for assigning the Cynegeticus to a younger Xenophon. In fact, the only prominent stylistic peculiarity of the Agesilaus and some of the other opuscula is (as Blass says) the immoderate use of *μήν* and *γε μήν* (see *de re equest.*, §§ 4–16 : *μήν* thirteen times on two pages); but this particle is not once used in our treatise.

Moreover it is impossible to decide upon the authorship of this work from the statement of Diogenes Laertius that Xenophon wrote *βιβλία πρὸς τὰ τετταράκοντα*, for he immediately adds, *ἄλλων ἄλλως διαιρούντων*. There is no help to a decision from the position of the treatise in the MSS. In the Florentine MS. (53, 21), the only one which contains the Cynegeticus with other opuscula, this tract is placed first, and such was its position in the earliest edition (in Latin at Florence, 1504).

The Aldine edition (1525) was the first to place it at the end of the works, where it has since remained.

All these things make it difficult to refute the Xenophontic origin of the work, or any part of it. But on the other hand the authority of Arrian and the rest in support of its authenticity proves too much. Arrian and Libanius referred to and quoted the proëmium, the genuineness of which no one would now claim. We only infer that the work existed in its present form, and was accepted as Xenophon's, at the beginning of the second century after Christ.

Further, the discussion of this question on the ground of the internal evidence of style and constructions is made easier and surer by our having more than eleven hundred pages of Xenophon's writings, the authenticity of which has never been questioned. We are thus able to observe the minute details of his style as well as the general features which are set forth by Hermogenes (Spengel, *Rhet. Gr.* II, 418): "Ἔστι τοίνυν οὗτος ἀφελὴς μὲν ὅτι μάλιστα . . . . καὶ ἀπλοῦς δὲ καὶ ἐνκρινής, εἴπερ τις ἕτερος, ὁ Ξενοφῶν. His constructions are simple. He avoids all involved sentences, as he does all abstruse thought.

But we have not merely voluminous writings of Xenophon, but works of every period of his life, and on various subjects, from the *Memorabilia* and *Anabasis*, written soon after his return from service with Agesilaus in Asia Minor, to the *Cyropaedia*, *Hellenica*, and treatise on the *Revenues of Athens*, which occupied his later years. We are almost admitted to his study. We see how ready he is to use a second time, in almost the same language, a good thought. We see how several experiences of his own and sayings of Socrates are combined to form incidents and speeches in his romance, the *Cyropaedia*.

Cyrus the Great, before Babylon, is made to extricate his forces from a difficult position by the device which Agesilaus used before Mantinea (*Hell.* VI, 5, 18). Cyrus the elder gains the affections of his subordinates by the same attentions as Cyrus the younger. The same thoughts on the Delphic motto, *Γνώθι σαυτόν* are found in the *Memorabilia*, in the dialogue between Socrates and the beautiful Enthydemus, and in the

Cyropaedia in the conversation between Croesus and Cyrus. These books contain the same warnings to young officers that a knowledge of tactics is a small part of military science; the same remarks on the gradual change of the seasons; the same views of prayer and the gods' unwearied care for men, of ingratitude, of οὐ δοκεῖν ἀλλ' εἶναι; the same thoughts on catching hares. The list might be indefinitely extended, and all these examples are in language so similar as to show the identity at a glance. It would be easy to show a similar connection between Xenophon's other works.

If then Xenophon writes a treatise on a subject to which, as was shown at the beginning of the paper, he has referred so often, and especially in the Cyropaedia, like this, one of his later works, we should expect to find many of the same thoughts, in the same style, and not infrequently in the same words. The objection that the subject excuses unusual words and style in this point of view has less weight. I find but two passages (VI, 26 and VII, 11) which could be considered in any sense parallel to anything that we find in the other works of our author. These are directions to the master to feed the dogs himself whenever it is possible, and to rub down the dogs before leaving the hunting-ground. Similar advice is given in regard to horses in the treatise Περὶ ἵππων.

As regards words, I may say that we are surprised to find here so few hunting words which had been used in the other works. *θήρατρον*, *σύνθηρος*, *συνθηρευτής*, *πλέγματα*, *ποδάγραι*, *ἄρπεδοί*, *ὁ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρκυσι* = *ὁ ἄρκυωρός* and others, which are found in the *Memorabilia* and *Cyropaedia*, are not met with in this tract.

But I will proceed to notice certain peculiarities of the *Cynegeticus*.

Remarkable is the frequent occurrence of *asyndeta*. Xenophon on occasion uses the asyndeton effectively. Addressing the soldiers after the treachery of Tissaphernes, he speaks of those who trusted the Persians as *παιόμενοι, κεντούμενοι, ὑβριζόμενοι*. In the *Anabasis* v, 2, 14, the soldiers ran together *καὶ τὰ βέλη ὁμοῦ ἐφέρετο, λόγχοι, τοξέματα, σφενδόνας κτλ.* In other cases there is somewhat less animation, as in *Anab.* vi, 6, 1, where the Greeks at *Κάλπης Λιμῆν* plundered *πυροὺς καὶ κριθάς, οἶνον,*



ὄσπρια, μελίνας, σῶκα. But in all of Xenophon's larger works there are not so many instances of asyndeta as in these thirty-three pages; and no example like Cyn. v. 30, which section is remarkable in many ways, but does not stand alone in this little work. Cf. v, 18, τοὺς λίθους, τὰ ὄρη, τὰ φέλλεια, τὰ εὐσεία. Cf. also vi, 1, Κυνῶν δὲ κόσμος δέραια, ἱμάντες, τελαμωνίαι· ἔστω δὲ τὰ μὲν δέραια μαλακά, πλατέα κτλ. Some passages may easily be emended, as vi, 8, μακρὰ [καί] ὑψηλά. Others are in themselves unobjectionable, as perhaps ix, 1 and xi, 1, but taken together they are extraordinarily frequent, and the first mentioned, v, 30, is desperate. There is no rhetorical animation to excuse it, nor a long list of qualities of one object, but the sentence is made obscure by the frequent juxtaposition, without conjunction, of two or three nouns or adjectives.

I notice next the use of prepositions. Professor Tyler says (Transactions for 1873) that thirty-six per cent. of Xenophon's verbs are compounded with prepositions. Beginning with i, 18, the part of the work most Xenophontic in character, we find that thirty-seven per cent. of the verbs in the first nine sections are compounded with prepositions; while in chapter v. we find that fifty-seven of the first hundred verbs are so compounded. This can hardly be mere chance, especially as many of these compound verbs do not differ sensibly in meaning from the simple. Thus εὐδῆ and καθεύδῃ, κινεῖ and ὑποκινεῖ are used in parallel passages; ἐπιγνωρίζω like γνωρίζω; ὑπάγω like ἄγω.

This of course points clearly to a later origin for the passages in which the unusual number of compounds is found.

Further. On the twenty-seven pages which are devoted to the treatise proper, excluding the proëmium and epilogue, there are twenty-one verbs which are compounded with two or more prepositions, thirteen of the twenty-one being on the ten pages which begin with chapter iii. The last twenty-seven pages of the seventh book of the Cyropaedia, which I took up at random, have but one verb so compounded. Other passages have more, but that the large number here is not due to chance or the nature of the subject, is obvious from a glance at some of the verbs; ἐγκαταπλέκω being equal to ἐμπλέκω, ἐγκαταρράπτω to ἐνράπτω. Compare προδιεξέλθωσι, v, 4. It is

evidently the result of the growing tendency, noticeable e. g. in New Testament Greek, to make the verb more definite by prefixing a new preposition.

Moreover, there are on these twenty-seven pages forty-three cases (thirty-one different verbs) of the repetition of the preposition with which the verb is compounded, before the noun, as ἀπὸ τῶν κυνηγεσίων ἀπαλλάττουσι, ὑπερφορεῖ ὑπὲρ τῶν τοιούτων, and others. In the Memorabilia, one hundred and forty-two pages, I have noticed but thirteen examples of this repetition; and of these thirteen, two are in passages suspected by Valckenaer and Dindorf. In the three hundred and thirteen pages of the Cyropaedia I noted but fifty-five examples. At this rate the twenty-seven pages of which we are treating should have not more than five, instead of forty-three. This of course may indicate hasty preparation as well as interpolation, but we are hardly prepared to find it in Xenophon.

A few instances of irregular constructions with prepositions and verbs compounded with prepositions, deserve our notice. Chapter v, § 18 we find ἀποχωρῶσι τοὺς λίθους. The first example I find of an accusative after this verb is in the scholia to Euripides's Phoenissae, 105. Two lines farther on ἀποχωρίζουσι is found, and ἀποχωροῦσι might easily be emended, but Dindorf has remarked on the transitive use of χωρεῖν in this sense in late Greek. Perhaps this accusative (v, 15) is better explained as the limit of motion, but one would be puzzled to parallel that from Xenophon.

For ἀφίστανται τὸν ἥλιον, III, 3, Dindorf, following Schaefer compares Anab. II, 5, 7, a well-known sentence: τὸν γὰρ θεῶν πόλεμον οὐκ οἶδα οὐτ' ἀπὸ ποίου ἂν τάχους φεύγων τις ἀποφύγοι, . . . ἀποδραίη, . . . ἀποσταίη. But surely the Greek usage did not demand the repetition of a noun in another case because the third verb in such a series did not govern the accusative. So our construction, τὸν ἥλιον, is unusual in Xenophon.

The use of ἀπὸ in such expressions as IV, 4, γνωρίζουσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ θυμοῦ, ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς, ἀπὸ τῶν ὀμμάτων κτλ, is not Xenophontic, Compare x, 12, τὴν κίνησιν ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς, instead of the simple genitive.

Peculiar also is the use of διὰ with the genitive. III, 5, δια-

τρέχουσι διὰ τοῦ ἵχνους, tho VII, 6 we have διατρέχειν τὰ ἵχνη, which is obviously the normal construction. Compare with this IV, 3, προΐτωσαν διὰ τοῦ ἵχνους, and VI, 22, διάπτωσι διὰ τοῦ ἵχνους, and strangest of all, X, 16, ἀφίκουτ' ἄν διὰ τῆς ῥάβδου. We have an example of this in St. Matt. VIII, 28—παρελθεῖν διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ, but it is not classic usage, and by no means parallel to διὰ τῶν ὁρέων, διὰ τῶν τάξεων and the like.

Μετά is used eight times, *σύν* but once, except in composition. One use of μετά is unquestionably not Xenophontic. XI, 3, the the wild beasts descending to the plain by night are caught μετὰ ἵππων καὶ ὄπλων.

The preposition is sometimes irregularly omitted, as IV, 9, εἰς τὰ ὄρη πολλάκις, τὰ δὲ ἔργα ἦγον. Cf. V, 15, τοῦς λειμῶνας, τὰς νάπας.

In connection with these may be noticed V, 27, ἅμα τούτοις = "besides this reason." VIII, 1, ἔξω πολὺν χρόνον seems clearly corrupt, as ἔξω cannot be naturally joined with δῆλα. Another particle to be noticed is ὅτε in ὅτε μὲν, and ὅτε δέ. Never used in the larger works of Xenophon, it is found in this treatise four times, V, 8 and 20; IX, 8 and 20.

In IV, 1, τὰ μεγέθη μεταξὺ μακρῶν καὶ βραχέων, we notice that Xenophon regularly uses the singular of μέγεθος, and that μεταξὺ can hardly be found in Xenophon used to denote what is between two qualities, as here, "long, short, *between* these." Compare also V, 8, ἀποθεν πολὺ, μικρόν, μεταξὺ τούτων, "far away, near, *between* these."

Another peculiarity is the omission of the reflexive pronoun, especially with ῥιπτεῖν and its compounds. V, 4, χαίροντες γὰρ τῷ φέγγει ἐπαναρριπτοῦντες μακρὰ διαιροῦσιν ἀντιπαίζοντες, where we expect αὐτούς with both διαιροῦσιν and ἐπαναρριπτοῦντες. Cf. V, 8, ὅτε δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ διαρριπτῶν. Also VI, 22, ἐπρριπτοῦσα, and IX, 20, ῥιπτοῦσι. Where Theognis speaks of poverty he says (175):

ἦν δὲ χρὴ φεύγοντα καὶ ἐς μεγαλήτεα πόντον  
ῥιπτεῖν καὶ πετρῶν, Κύρνε, κατ' ἡλιβάτων.

Two similar examples of the use of ῥιπτῶ are found in Euripides, and one in Menander, but I have met with none in Xenophon's unquestioned works, nor in other classic prose.

We find in this treatise, moreover, an unusual number of periphrastic expressions, specially with ἔχειν. μηδὲν ὦν ἢ γῆ ἀνίησιν (VI, 25) is not unlike πάντα ὅσα ὄραι φύουσι (Anab. I, 4, 10), but x, 23, ὦν ἂν ὤσιν ἄμφω as equal to "both the parents" of the wild beast, is not so natural. Many periphrases with ἔχειν are found in all of Xenophon's works. They are not uncommon also in Isocrates, as in his Panegyricus, § 67, we find ἔστι γὰρ ἀρχικώτατα καὶ μεγίστας δυναστείας ἔχοντα. The rhythmical argument for the construction is quite lacking, however, in sentences like IV, 1, of our tract, πρῶτον μὲν οὖν χρή εἶναι μεγάλας εἶτα ἐχούσας τὰς κεφαλὰς ἐλαφράς κτλ. Cf. III, 3, ἀσύντακτα ἔχουσαι τὰ σώματα. Stranger still is IV, 8, αἱ μὲν οὖν πυρραὶ ἔχουσαι ἔστωσαν λευκὴν τρίχα κτλ, and VI, 1, οἱ δὲ ἱμάντες [ἔστωσαν] ἔχοντες ἀγκύλας κτλ. Most awkward of all, however, is the beginning of VI, 5, τὴν δὲ στολὴν ὁ ἀρκυρὸς ἐξίτω ἔχων ἐπὶ θήραν μὴ ἔχουσαν βάρος, where the ἔχουσαν so near θήραν, and far from στολήν, is a clumsiness which we can scarcely impute to Xenophon, especially as the same short sentence has another case of that participle. I can give parallel examples only from later Greek, as Pausanias v. 18, ἀνὴρ τῇ μὲν δεξιᾷ κύλικα τῇ δὲ ἔχων ἔστιν ὄρμον.

Another peculiarity of this opusculum in its present form is the use of the infinitive. Perhaps εἶναι in IX, 1, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς νεβροῖς καὶ τὰς ἐλάφους κύνας εἶναι Ἰνδικάς, will serve as an example. Compare κεκτῆσθαι, x, 1. It is evident that these are not exactly like Περὶ Ἰππικῆς III, 7, πεῖραν λαμβάνειν, where the infinitive is in apposition with the λαμβάνειν contained in ληπτέον of the preceding clause. At the beginning of chapters IX and x the subject is changed, and after the break it is not a mere matter of course to carry on the force of the δεῖ in VIII, 8. In v, 15 also we have this infinitive λαμβάνειν without any word on which to depend. No χρή or δεῖ has been used in the whole chapter; and that this is not the imperative use of the infinitive is shown by the accusative of the participle ὑπάγοντα, which must agree with the subject of λαμβάνειν. This example in v, 15 is the first in the work. Before this the imperative and the infinitive with χρή are used. Thus in chapter IV the imperative is used nine times; χρή twice;

ἄμεινόν ἐστι once, and ἀγαθόν ἐστι once. After v, 15 the next is ἀπέχου, v, 34, which, if it were alone, might be taken as used for the imperative. vi, 3, ἄγειν may be taken to depend on the *χρή* in § 2. So also in § 4. But vi, 11, we have τὸν δὲ *κυνηγέτην ἐξίέναι* after twelve imperatives. This infinitive is constant thenceforward to the end of chapter x. Chapter xi is brief, and xii and xiii do not need it or have it. This infinitive must depend on the idea of advice stated, ii, 2, ὅσα δὲ καὶ οἷα δεῖ παρεσκευασμένον ἐλθεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸ φράσω καὶ αὐτὰ καὶ τὴν ἐπιστήμην ἐκάστου ἵνα προειδῶς ἐγχειρῇ τῷ ἔργῳ. But it is more than seven pages after this that the first infinitive is found which depends on this introductory sentence.

If some of these peculiarities seem slight, and the argument to be founded on them weak, I would call attention to the cumulative force when several of these unusual constructions are found in one passage.

For myself, then, I am convinced that Xenophon did not write this treatise in the form in which we have it. A comparison, however, of the passages in which the most marked peculiarities to which I have referred occur, shows that most of the solecisms and difficulties are contained in certain sections and chapters which may be omitted without interfering with the symmetry of the work; and further, such omission will remove certain difficulties in what remains.

The results of my investigation are as follows:

Xenophon began with i, 18. The long list of heroes who excelled in the chase, found in the proëmium, is not so much in the style of Xenophon as of the later rhetoricians; and, as Mure remarks, it is absurd to preface with so much pomp a tract mainly devoted in its present form to the pursuit of *hares*, which were not the game of Hercules and Theseus; ἀναγορευθῆναι for ἀναρρηθῆναι (i, 14) is not Attic; and the style in general of these first seventeen sections is not that of the *Memorabilia*, nor of the *Cyropaedia*. To begin with ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν (i, 18) seems at first abrupt, but is not unlike the beginning of the *Revenues of Athens*, ἐγὼ μὲν τοῦτο κτλ.; nor the introduction to the *Hipparchicus*, Πρωτὸν μὲν θύοντα χρή κτλ.

Moreover, according to Schneider the Breslau manuscript omits the *οὐν* of the *ἐγὼ μὲν οὐν*, and until within the last century the editions began the second chapter with what is now § 18 of the first chapter.

To the close of II, 8, Xenophon writes of nets and their props. Then follows a long interpolation, out of connection here and containing many deviations from Xenophon's style, to VI, 7, where the dropped thread is again taken up and directions given for fixing the props for the nets. In these interpolated chapters are found the most unusual cases of *asyndeta*, the most remarkable periphrases (as VI, 5), and the greatest license in the use of prepositions.

From VI, 7, our author tells how the hunt is to be begun. The infinitive in that section can now, assuming this long interpolation, be easily made to depend on *ᾧσα δὲ καὶ οἷα δεῖ . . . φράσω* of II, 2. After VI, 16, there is an interpolation of six sections to the beginning of § 23 which resumes the narrative, and the close of chapter VI brings the hunter to his home after the chase of the hare.

Chapter VII is devoted to the care of dogs and their breeding. *ἀλλὰ διαλείπειν . . . ἡμέρας*, in § 2, §§ 5 and 8, and *τὰ εἶδη* in § 7, I consider interpolations.

Chapter VIII treats of tracking hares on the snow. Part of § 1, *εἰ δ' ἐνέσται . . . ἀφανίζει*, may be from a later hand.

Chapter IX, on hunting deer and fawns, has interpolated §§ 8–10, 13–16, 19–20. In §§ 8 and 20 we find the use of *ὅτε δέ*, which is unknown to the other works of Xenophon, and the reflexive use of *ῥιπτεῖν*.

In chapter X, on the wild boar, I hold §§ 4–18, and *χρηστέον . . . πάσχοι* in § 22, to be interpolated.

Chapter XI treats of hunting panthers, lynxes, etc., which were not at all in the line of Xenophon, who always writes from his own experiences. Moreover, the second paragraph speaks of poisoning water and food for the wild beasts, a procedure far from the sportsmanlike spirit of our author. In the third section, also, is the late use of *μετά*, of which I have previously spoken; and it is worth mentioning, perhaps, that *μετά* is found in the whole treatise eight times, but seven of

the eight times in passages rejected by me on other grounds. *σύν* is used but once (VI, 16, *σὺν ταῖς οὐραῖς*) out of composition, and that in a passage which I hold to belong to the original work. It is known that Xenophon used *μετά* less, and *σύν* more than his contemporaries and later writers.

Chapter XII may well be genuine as far as § 17, where the original ends, ending as it began with the praise of *Παιδεία*. The eighteenth section contains a direct reference to the proëmium than which, as Dindorf says, the epilogus is no better.

This scheme attributes to Xenophon less than half of the treatise before us; but it removes or explains a much larger proportion of the difficulties and solecisms, while what is left is in a condition to receive emendations which the wretched state of the MSS. renders necessary.

This theory relieves Xenophon of the responsibility for the following statements: that hares do not see well because they rush past everything with such rapidity that their eyes have no practice in examining objects carefully, and because their vision is injured by so much sleep (v, 26, 27); that their tails are too short to be of much use to them as rudders in running, but they make use of their ears, dropping them to the ground and bracing themselves upon them when they turn quickly to avoid the hounds (v, 32); that the breath of the wild boar is so hot as to scorch the hair of the dogs which approach him; and that a hair laid upon his tusk immediately after his death will shrivel up (x, 17). These statements, which savor of Aelian and the later writers, are all in rejected passages. My theory also relieves Xenophon of the responsibility for a few stupid puns and unnatural rhetorical clauses. Compare v, 17, *Ξέονσι γὰρ μάλιστα μὲν τὰ ἀνάντη ἢ τὰ ὀμαλά, τὰ δὲ ἀνόμοια ἀνομοίως* (uneven places *unevenly*, i. e. less than up hill, more than down hill), *τὰ δὲ κατάντη ἥκιστα*. Here *ἀνομοίως* is used, obviously introduced solely for the sake of the Paronomasia. Compare vi, 20, where the hunter *τοῦνομα μεταβάλλοντα* (literally *changing* the name, where he means calling the name of each in succession) *ἐκάστης τῆς κυνός*, is to shout, making the sound of his voice *ὄξύ, βαρύ, μικρόν, μέγα*. Of what advantage

it would be to give a *little* call, when the hounds are supposed to be at a distance, we are not informed. But it would take us too long to consider every example of slovenliness or stupidity of thought and construction in the work as we have it. The same portions of the work, then, which contain statements and thoughts which we are not ready to ascribe to Xenophon, also contain the unusual constructions to which I have called attention. The theory propounded in this paper claims attention on the ground that it so largely removes what is unlike to or unworthy of Xenophon, and still leaves a framework far more symmetrical than the traditional form, with a beginning, a well-arranged middle, and an end.

From the external evidence in its favor, as well as from certain internal marks of style, I am inclined to believe that the *Cynegeticus* is from the hand of Xenophon. If that be still disputed, I claim that the evidence here brought forward for an earlier and a later hand in its composition is still unshaken.

The interpolator generally contented himself with inserting chapters and paragraphs. Only occasionally are we obliged to cut out from a sentence which seems Xenophontic a word or two which, as is evident from other passages, proceeded from the second hand. Only once is it necessary to the construction of the sentence to supply anything from an interpolated section. In VI, 7, ὁ ἀγκυωρός, the subject of ἐπιβαλλέτω, must have been dropped by the diasceuast when he wrote §§ 5 and 6.

Who this interpolator was, it is perhaps idle now to inquire. We only know that he must have lived not later than the beginning of our era; for Arrian early in the second century after Christ seems to have accepted this tract in its present form as the work of Xenophon.

---